IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition No. 223 of 2005 (S/B)

Surya Nath Singh,
S/o Late Sri Meghan Singh,
Serving as District Panchayati Raj Officer,
Chamoli. … Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Uttaranchal,
   through Secretary, Department of Panchayati Raj,
   Govt. of Uttranchal, Dehradun.
2. Director, Panchayati Raj,
   Uttaranchal, Dehradun.
3. District Magistrate,
   Chamoli.
4. State Advisory Committee,
   constituted under U.P. Reorganization Act 2000,
   Gate No. 31, Jahawar Lal Nehru Stadium,
   New Delhi through its Chairman.
5. Union of India through Secretary,
   Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pension,
   (Department of Personnel and Training),
   Govt. of India, Lok Naik Bhawan,
   IIIrd Floor, Khan Market, New Delhi.
6. State of U.P. through Principal Secretary,
   Department of Panchayati Raj,
   Govt. of U.P., Lucknow. … Respondents

Mr. Manoj Tewari, Advocate for the petitioner.

Coram: Hon'ble Cyriac Joseph, C.J.
Hon'ble P.C. Verma, J.

JUDGMENT

CYRIAC JOSEPH, C.J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner who is working as District Panchayati Raj Officer, Chamoli is aggrieved by the non-inclusion of his name in the final list of officers allotted to the Panchayati Raj Department of the Government of Uttaranchal and the consequential order dated 22.08.2005 (Annexure 10) relieving him from the State of Uttaranchal with direction to report for duty before the Government of U.P.

According to the petitioner, he had submitted option for allotment to the State of Uttaranchal, but he has not been informed why he was not included in the Final Allocation List. The petitioner has submitted Annexure 8 representation dated 23.08.2005 to the Chairman, State Advisory Committee constituted under the U.P. Reorganization Act, 2000, Gate No. 31, Jawahar Lal Nehru Stadium, New Delhi (fourth respondent). According to the petitioner, the said representation has not been disposed of.

3. In the above circumstances, we do not consider it expedient to admit this writ petition. The interest of the petitioner will be better served by issuing a direction to the fourth respondent to consider and pass appropriate orders on Annexure 8 representation of the petitioner as expeditiously as possible.

4. Hence, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the fourth respondent to consider and pass appropriate orders on Annexure 8 representation dated 23.08.2005 of the petitioner as expeditiously as possible and at any rate, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

The petitioner may produce a copy of this judgment before the fourth respondent for his information and compliance.

(P.C. Verma, J.) **(Cyriac Joseph, C.J.)**
12.09.2005 **12.09.2005**

G